

818 INDUSTRY RELIEF MEETING

**March 9 & 10, 1995
Burbank Airport Hilton
Burbank, CA**

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Monthly report on 818 NPA actual code usage was presented by Mary Franco, Code Administrator for Los Angeles. Mary will bring information regarding where the growth is occurring to the next meeting.

J. G. Harrington presented SNET Area Code Relief Survey completed December, 1994. Geographic split preferred by 54% of respondents.

Dodie Barr and Greg Tedesco presented 708 Area Code Focus Group Research completed April, 1994. 55% preferred overlay with mandatory 10 digit dialing (after eliminating wireless only alternative).

Paula Olivares led a discussion of the relative lives of various split alternatives. Eleven Relief Alternatives were then discussed, attributes listed, and finally, some were eliminated.

Relief Alternatives:

Alternative #1

1. Splits Burbank and Glendale, Arroyo Verdugo Region
2. 59% West / 41% East split
3. More growth in West than East.

Status: Eliminate; splits Arroyo Verdugo Region

Alternative #2

1. Splits City of Los Angeles
2. 46% / 54% split
3. More growth in East
4. Could balance with tandem

Status: Keep

Alternative #3

1. Splits City of Los Angeles
2. 41% / 59% split
3. More growth in East

Status: Eliminate; splits Northridge and North Hills

Alternative #4

1. Splits Glendale and Pasadena, Arroyo Verdugo Region
2. Represents natural boundary (Arroyo Seco)
3. More growth in West
4. 66% / 34% split

Status: Eliminate; splits region and too imbalanced

Alternative #5

1. Splits City of Burbank (5 blocks)
2. Splits media cluster
3. 54% / 46% split
4. More growth in East

Status: Keep

Alternative #6 - 818 Overlay

1. Simplest overlay
2. Longest relief among overlays

Status: Keep

Alternative #7 - 818 + 213 Overlay

1. Customer confusion
2. Shorter relief period for new NPA
3. Extends life of 213
4. Loss of geographic identity

Status: Eliminate; shorter life, confusing

Alternative #8 - 818 + 310 Overlay

1. Really confusing to customer
2. Shorter relief period for 818
3. Loss of geographic identity
4. Subject to contingency (lawsuit)

Status: Eliminate; shorter life, confusing

Alternative #9 - Double Split

1. Splits City of Los Angeles
2. Reinforces Media Cluster and Arroyo Verdugo Region
3. Requires two new NPAs
4. Longer relief period
5. Requires dual permissive dialing
6. Growth is nearly even (areas about even)
7. Required 2/3 of customers to change NPAs

Alternative #9 - Double Split (continued)

8. Potential issues around permissive dialing
9. Adds an extra degree of confusion for the public
10. Look into city boundaries versus W. C. boundaries in San Gabriel Valley

Status: Keep

Alternative #10 - 3-Way Overlay

1. Provides shortest relief life
2. Subject to contingency
3. Historic 213 identity
4. Greatest loss of geographic identity
5. Customer confusion regarding intra-LATA toll calling.

Status: Eliminate, shortest life

Alternative #11 - Half Donut Split

1. 3-way with East and West having same NPA.

Status: Eliminate; too confusing

Public meetings were discussed

- 3-5 public meetings
- Coordinate with 619
- 3-way split - questions to be answered:
 - Technical - routing and billing
 - NANPA assignment

Volunteers for editing subcommittee:

Dodie Barr	Jeffrey Grigsby	J. G. Harrington
Jennifer Johns	Michael Morris	Walter Mosley
Greg Tedesco		

Time Line

- Lead time 6 weeks before first press release.
- Second press release 4 weeks prior to public meetings.

Issue

- Determine which portion of split alternatives keeps 818 NPA.

818 INDUSTRY RELIEF MEETING

April 11 & 12, 1995
Burbank Airport Hilton
Burbank, CA

DRAFT

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

The 818 NPA NXX Code Growth and the 818 COCUS Preliminary Forecast were presented by Mary Franco, Code Administration for Los Angeles. The 1995 COCUS submittal form was handed out and discussed by Bruce Bennett, California Code Administration.

Donna Sylvestre handed out two recent CPUC Press Releases.

J. G. Harrington handed out an excerpt from pending federal legislation (Pressler Bill).

Harry Soukiassian of Hye Page proposed 8 digit dialing as a relief alternative.

PB can't make unilateral decision on code sharing
✓ Michael Morris asked for the status of assigning tandem codes by thousands groups. Ed Angle will provide status at the next meeting. *LIDB data base*

Paula Olivares handed out maps showing the four alternatives under discussion.

J.G. Harrington presented a spreadsheet of the alternatives using 818 NXX growth and various assumptions. Paula Olivares summarized this work as follows:

Alternative		Exhaust date
2	W - 818	1Q10
	E - new	2Q03
5	W - 818	3Q06
	E - new	1Q06
9	W - new	2Q12
	C - 818	4Q13
	E - new	1Q13
6	818/new	3Q07

DRAFT

DRAFT

Dodie Barr presented an 818 Exhaust Relief Contribution from Pagenet proposing an overlay of 818 only.

Paula Olivares led a discussion of the relative lives of various split alternatives. Alternative # 2 was eliminated because of short life by consensus.

A long discussion of dialing in alternative 6 took place.

Nine companies prefer 10 digit dialing because

1. ICCF NPA Code Relief Guidelines section 5.3 recommend
2. partially mitigates competitive issues
3. mitigates problem for business customers
4. less customer confusion
5. in use in overlays elsewhere

Bell Core Letter

Two companies (including GTE) prefer 7 digit dialing because

1. consistency within state is important
2. 10 digit dialing statewide is burden for other NPAs
3. have permissive 10 digit dialing now

Three companies believe this is an issue for the CPUC to decide.

One company had no position at this time.

✓ *2-3 years to implement*
Is there time to implement number portability prior to 818 exhaust? Ed Angle to report back.

Walter Mosely suggested an editing subcommittee to draft 1) a script for public meetings, 2) a press release and 3) Qs & A's. The team agreed to delegate these responsibilities to a subcommittee. Volunteers for the editing subcommittee were:

Dodie Barr	J. G. Harrington	Paula Olivares
Gwen Blankken	Walter Mosley	Kitty Wenrick
Linda Bonniksen	Mike Murray	

DRAFT

Thermon Beck
Conna
Burkhard
Mrs. Adina
San Fern. City Hall
The team tentatively scheduled public meetings to be held the week of July 17th. Anita Gabriellian will identify meeting locations. Specifics will be brought to the next meeting. Paula Olivares will prepare a tentative budget for public meetings. Jennifer Johns will look into CATV access for public meeting notification.

Donna Sylvestre, CPUC outreach office, stated she is here on behalf of the DRA to observe. She is willing to be of assistance to all parties. Her comments are not reflective of the four Commissioners. She suggested that the group might

DRAFT

want to present more than one option at the Public Meetings, giving the pros and cons of each option.

Russell Fox suggested that #9 is not feasible due to political considerations.

Walter Moselly suggested that #5 be considered as a consensus. 7 in favor, 4 opposed.

Russell Fox suggested that #6 be considered as a consensus. 8 in favor, 6 opposed.

All agreed to go back to her/his company to discuss and reconvene on May 1 to reach consensus.

DRAFT

818 INDUSTRY RELIEF MEETING

May 1 & 2, 1995

Burbank Airport Hilton

Burbank, CA

DRAFT

Report on action items from April 11 & 12 Meeting

1. Status of assigning tandem codes by thousands groups. (code sharing)

Andrea Cooper reported that this issue would require industry agreement - that it was a national issue, not just local to California. Guidelines would need to be written and agreed to. There are major problems with the LIDB database if this were to be implemented. To implement code sharing could take 2-3 years, potentially the same time frame as local number portability. Pacific Bell's position is that it would rather expend the time and resources on a number portability solution rather than on code sharing.

2. Implementation of number portability before 818 exhaust.

Andrea Cooper reported that number portability issues are being worked nationally through the Industry Numbering Committee. The states of New York and Washington are currently involved in local trials. It is likely that the CPUC will order a full-scale trial of number portability in California to be implemented within one year of the effective date of the Interim Rules for local exchange competition. Given the activity in the local regulatory area and the INC process it is unlikely that a number portability solution will be implemented prior to 818 exhaust.

Consensus Discussion

Option 9 was set aside for now. The focus of the meeting was to try to reach a consensus on option 5 or option 6. Option 9 may be presented to the public as an alternative which was considered but not recommended.

Contribution by AT&T for consensus on alternative 5. After lengthy discussion a straw vote was taken on consensus on alternative 5. In favor - 11, opposed - 3, abstain - 4. This does not constitute consensus.

Next a straw vote was taken on a consensus on alternative 6. In favor - 4, opposed - 6 abstain - 8. This does not constitute consensus.

Six Wireless companies offered a contribution to be used only if a consensus cannot be reached. Their contribution offered as a viable next step, to take both alternative 5 and alternative 6 to the public meetings for public input.

DRAFT

A review was made of the groups represented: LECs, IECs, CAPS, CLECs, and Wireless Carriers.

The definition of Consensus was reviewed:

The two key words are **materially affected**. Today LECs and Wireless are the materially affected groups.

A general discussion of alternative 5 and alternative 6 continued. The industry segment concerns were as follows:

CAPs, CLECs and IECs viewed alternative 6 as anti-competitive.

Point noted: Cox Cable noted that the FCC, in its Illinois area code decision, has indicated that competitive issues are relevant to area code relief decisions.

LECs viewed alternative 5 as a major disruption to existing customers.

Wireless companies were open to either alternative 5 or alternative 6. In their contribution suggested using a statistically reliable survey to gather more public input.

A final straw vote was taken identifying alternative 5 as the only alternative fully defined at this time. In favor - 13, opposed - 3, abstain - 3. This does not constitute consensus.

Public Meetings

Public meeting have been tentatively scheduled in five locations: San Fernando, Sherman Oaks, Burbank, Pasadena and Covina.

Budget and allocation of costs

A budget for Public Meetings and Press Release was discussed. For 5 Public meetings the approximate total is \$34,000. Paula Olivares will develop a more detailed budget for the next meeting.

Survey

A subcommittee was formed to pursue the idea of the industry sponsoring stastically reliable survey.

DRAFT

The following items were not discussed:

Press Release date

Editing draft documents

Press Release

Script for Public meetings

Q's & A's

Next meeting

The next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for July 17, 1995, pending the CPUC ruling. The meeting will be held, at the Burbank Airport Hilton beginning at 9:00 AM.

I recognize there is a conflict with the 619 public meeting date. For those of you not familiar with the area, you can easily get to San Diego from Burbank for an evening meeting.

DOW, LOHNES & ALBERTSON

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

255 TWENTY-THIRD STREET

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20037-1194

J. S. HARRINGTON

DIRECTOR

887 28-8

TELEPHONE 202-697-2500

FACSIMILE 202-697-2000

June 2, 1995

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Ms. Paula Olivares
818 NPA Relief Coordinator
Pacific Bell
100 N. Stoneman Avenue
Room 200
Alhambra, CA 91801

Re: 818 Relief Planning Workshop
Meeting Notes for May Meeting

Dear Paula:

I am in receipt of the draft meeting notes for the last meeting of the 818 relief planning workshop. I am surprised and concerned with the significant omissions and inaccuracies in the notes. I must request that you correct them immediately. I am writing rather than calling you because I believe it is important to document my concerns for the entire workshop.

First, and most significantly, the meeting notes omit material that I specifically requested to be included regarding the impact of competitive issues on the area code relief decision. As you know, Les Baker, one of the voting representatives of Pacific Bell, stated during the discussion of competitive issues on May 1 that those issues are "irrelevant" to area code relief decisions. He went on to say that Pacific Bell did not believe that they should be discussed as part of relief planning, and that it was "tough luck" for new entrants if they did not agree with that position. I then requested that this view be reflected in the meeting notes. I further requested that the meeting notes reflect that the FCC has a different view of competitive issues under the recent Illinois area code decision. There was no objection from any party, including Pacific Bell, to my request.

Later in the meeting, I provided you with proposed text for the portion of the meeting notes that would reflect the discussion of competition-related issues. That text was as follows:

Ms. Paula Olivares

June 2, 1995

Page 2

Pacific Bell stated that it believes that competitive issues are not relevant and should not be considered in determining what relief plan should be proposed.

Cox stated that it disagreed with Pacific Bell and noted that the FCC, in its Illinois area code decision, has indicated that competitive issues are relevant to area code relief decisions.

You did not object to this text, and in the four weeks since the meeting you have not indicated to me in any way that either you, in your role as Relief Coordinator, or Pacific Bell had any objection to any element of the text. Nevertheless, you did not include this text, or any reasonable modification of it. Instead, you omitted any reference to Pacific Bell's position.^{1/}

Given the events at the meeting and the reaction of Pacific Bell, the other participants and yourself to my request for inclusion of this information, your omission of the proposed text regarding Pacific Bell's statements comes as a surprise. There is no question that these events occurred, or that they were significant in the context of the meeting. If you have any intention of producing meeting notes that accurately reflect the events of this meeting, it is necessary to include a description of Pacific Bell's stated position on consideration of the competitive effects of area code relief plans.

I can understand why Pacific Bell might wish to avoid public disclosure of these statements. Nevertheless, Pacific Bell cannot cause them to disappear. There simply is no justification for omitting them from the meeting notes, especially in light of the specific request that they be included. If nothing else, your omission of Pacific Bell's statements raises serious questions regarding the objectivity of the meeting notes.

The omission of a description of Mr. Baker's statements on behalf of Pacific Bell also is contrary to the approach adopted in the Industry Numbering Committee, which has determined that a meeting record should reflect "succinct and accurate documentation . . . of the major thrust(s) of the discussion that has taken place during the meeting associated with a given topic." INC Standing Committee Administrative Guidelines (Document INC

1/ In the process, you also changed the reference to my client from "Cox" to "Cox Cable." As I have indicated at every meeting of the 818 Relief Workshop, I represent Cox Enterprises, which has interests beyond those of its subsidiary cable operations. These interests include the FCC license held by Cox's subsidiary Cox Communications, Inc. to provide personal communications services in a region that includes the 818 area code, a license which was granted before the 818 relief process began.

Ms. Paula Olivares
June 2, 1995
Page 3

95-0127-005) at 14. Indeed, omitting the Pacific Bell statement and altering the Cox statement seriously distorts "the major thrust[] of the discussion" by, among other things, making it appear that the Cox statement was made in a vacuum. Thus, the notes must be corrected to reflect Pacific Bell's statements if they are to reflect the actual discussion at the meeting and comply with the principles used in recording the meetings of INC and other industry forums.

Although the omission of Pacific Bell's statements regarding competition is the most egregious error in these meeting notes, there are other significant inaccuracies as well. Descriptions of the other errors I have discovered are attached to this letter. I am particularly concerned that these errors, taken together, bias the meeting notes in favor of positions that Pacific Bell has taken. Because these meeting notes are provided to California Public Utilities Commission personnel, the dangers of such a bias are particularly acute. Inaccurate statements, such as the claim that only LECs and wireless carriers are "materially affected" by the area code relief decision, may lead the PUC to believe that those statements reflect the view of the workshop, when in fact they do not. I know that many of the participants have felt that they have been engaged in a constant, not entirely successful, struggle to have the meeting notes actually reflect the discussions and decisions reached at the 818 relief meetings. The errors and omissions in the meeting notes for the May meeting reinforce my concerns in this area.

Please inform me if any questions should arise in connection with this letter.

Very truly yours,



J.G. Harrington

cc: **Participants in 818 Relief Planning Workshop**

ERRORS IN 818 MEETING NOTES

The following are descriptions of errors in and omissions from the meeting notes for the May, 1995 meeting of the 818 Relief Planning Workshop. They are arranged in the order they should appear in the meeting notes.

Location	Text	Error
Page 1 Report on number portability	"The states of New York and Washington are currently involved in local trials."	Description omits trial in Illinois, which was included in Andrea Cooper's discussion.
Page 1 Report on action items	None	Omits California Cable Television Association's statement that it would be facilitating contacts with cable operators to provide public access or governmental channel coverage of public meetings.
Page 1 Discussion of option 9	"Option 9 [a three-way geographic split] may be presented to the public as an alternative which was considered but not recommended."	The agreement reached was to set aside Option 9 unless the group could not reach consensus on another option.
Page 2 Discussion of consensus	"The two key words are materially affected. Today LECs and Wireless are the materially affected groups." (emphasis in original)	There was no consensus on this point. This statement reflects the view of a Pacific Bell representative. Other participants in the meeting stated their disagreement with this view. It should be attributed to a party or interest group or omitted entirely.
Page 2 Discussion of industry segment concerns.	"CAPs, CLECs and IECs viewed alternative 6 as anti-competitive." (emphasis in original)	These parties stated at the meeting that an overlay is anticompetitive only in the absence of 11-digit dialing and number portability.
Page 2 Discussion of alternative 6 and competitive issues.	"Cox Cable noted that the FCC, in its Illinois area code decision, has indicated that competitive issues are relevant to area code relief decisions."	As described in the letter, this omits Pacific Bell's statements on this issue, seriously distorting the thrust of the discussion.

Errors In 818 Meeting Notes

Page 2

Location	Text	Error
Page 2 Discussion of industry segment concerns	"Wireless companies were open to either alternative 5 or alternative 6. In their contribution suggested using a statistically reliable survey to gather more public input." (emphasis in original)	This does not reflect the views of all companies with wireless interests. Cox does not support alternative 6 in its present form. Most wireless participants will support alternative 6 only if it includes 11-digit dialing, which is not included in the current description of the proposal.
Page 2 Budget and allocation of costs	None	This section omits any description of the discussion of whether the costs of relief planning, including public meetings, are subsumed in Pacific Bell's charges for opening NXX codes. In light of the views of the wireless providers on this matter, it is a significant issue.
Page 3 Next meeting	None	The notes omit any discussion of the proposal to suspend action in this workshop. This proposal was not adopted, but it should be documented. In addition, the discussion of the next meeting date, which makes the date dependent on CPUC action in the 310 proceeding, appears to be an implementation of the proposal to suspend action.
Page 3 Next meeting	"The next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for July 17, 1995, pending the CPUC ruling."	The agreement on the meeting date was not contingent on whether the CPUC rules on the 310 area code. (See above.)

Southern New England Telephone
227 Church Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06510
Phone (203) 771-9802

Kathleen A. Carrigan
Senior Counsel

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL

SNET 2-18
D-P-U-C
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

February 1, 1995

Robert J. Murphy, Executive Secretary
Department of Public Utility Control
One Central Park Plaza
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

RE: DPUC Docket No. 94-11-21
Application of The Southern New England Telephone Company
to Investigate Alternative Methods for Providing Area Code 203 Relief

ACCEPTED BY _____
COMMENTS B
DO _____ UR _____
AD _____ RM _____ GP _____ SC _____
AT _____ EC _____ IL _____ SF _____
CO 1 DE _____ HA _____ TE 4
CR _____ FL _____ FR _____ TR _____
CS _____ GE _____ EE 1 WA _____
CC _____ SMB

MT
Seth Del.

Dear Mr. Murphy:

Enclosed are an original and ten (10) copies of The Southern New England Telephone Company's ("Company") supplemental response to the Department of Public Utility Control's interrogatory numbered TE-22.

The supplemental response provides the results of the telephone survey which the Company conducted to determine customer preference relative to the relief alternatives for the exhaust of the "203" Area Code. The results of the survey show that of the three proposed relief alternatives, customers clearly favor the geographic split.

Should there be any questions concerning this submission, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

CERTIFICATION

An original and ten (10) copies of the foregoing have been hand delivered this February 1, 1995 to Robert J. Murphy, Executive Secretary, Department of Public Utility Control, One Central Park Plaza, New Britain, CT 06051; and two (2) copies of the foregoing have been hand delivered this February 1, 1995 to John F. Marchant, Office of Consumer Counsel, Suite 501, 136 Main Street, New Britain, CT 06051, and one copy sent this February 1, 1995, by First Class, U.S. Mail to all known parties and intervenors of record.

Kathleen A. Carrigan
Commissioner of the Superior Court

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL
Interrogatories to the Southern New England Telephone Company

TELEPHONE SURVEY RESULTS

Witness Responsible: Kurt D. Anderson
Dr. Scott Taylor

Question No. TE-22: Provide a copy of the documentation of telephone survey to determine customer preference of alternatives for "203" Area Code Exhaust that was described by the Company at the Meeting. Provide a copy of the documented results of the telephone survey, when completed. Identify the actual/estimated costs of conducting the telephone survey.

Answer: Attachment A is a copy of the results of the telephone survey which the Company conducted to determine customer preference relative to the relief alternatives for the exhaust of the "203" Area Code.

The cost of conducting the survey was \$79,800.

Docket No. 94-11-21
Request No. TE-22
Supplemental Response No. 1
February 1, 1995
Attachment A
Consisting of 64 pages

Telephone Survey Results

***Customer Preferences for
Introducing a New Area Code
In Connecticut***

Prepared for:

Southern New England Telephone

Prepared by:

The Taylor Group, Inc.

January, 1995

**THE TAYLOR GROUP, INC.
6 Glenville Street
Greenwich, CT 06831
(203) 532-0202**

Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Background and Objectives	1
Study Method	3
Sampling Error	4
Summary of Findings	5
1. Initial Reactions and Preferences	11
Introduction	11
Prior Awareness	11
Initial Reactions to Each Option	13
Customer Preferences	16
The Fairest Option	20
Conclusion	23
2. Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks of Each Option	24
Introduction	24
Top of Mind Reasons for Preferences	24
Reactions to Benefits and Drawbacks	27
Conclusion	34
3. The Impact of "Education"	36
Introduction	36
Preferences After Benefits and Drawbacks	36
Fairness After Benefits and Drawbacks	38
Geographic Split: Who Gets the Area Code Change?	39
Methods of Communicating the Change	42
Conclusion	43
Appendix: Survey Questionnaire	44

Introduction

Background and Objectives

As is the case in many jurisdictions across the country, available telephone numbers in Connecticut are, at present, in relatively short supply. As a result, a new area code will soon be introduced in the state.

Generally speaking, the most common way of introducing a new area code has traditionally been to assign the area code on a *geographic basis*. In other words, customers in a defined area of a particular jurisdiction get a new area code, while others keep the existing area code. However, another method of introducing a new area code, referred to as *overlay*, has begun to be used in certain areas (most recently in Chicago, and proposed for Los Angeles). With the *overlay* method, the new area code is assigned to only certain customers within a geographic area (for example, the new area code may be assigned to cellular phones or pagers, or it may be assigned to new customers), while other customers in that area keep the existing area code.

Three possible area code introduction methods are being considered for Connecticut -- one *geographic split* method and two *overlay* methods. The three methods are the following:

- ***Geographic Split:*** This option would divide Connecticut into two geographic regions. Everyone in one region would keep the 203 area code; everyone in the other region would get a

new area code.

- ***Distributed Overlay:*** With this option, households and businesses would continue to use the 203 area code until telephone numbers run out. At that point, all *new customers* in the state would get a new area code, regardless of where in the state they live.
- ***Service-Specific Overlay:*** With this option, a new area code would be assigned only to *specific services*, such as cellular telephones and pagers. The area code would remain the same for standard household and business service. (This option would relieve the telephone number shortage temporarily; after a few years, another option would need to be adopted.)

In December of 1994, Southern New England Telephone commissioned the Taylor Group, Inc., to conduct a quantitative research study whose primary objective was to determine which of the three area code introduction methods customers are most likely to prefer. More specifically, the research was designed to help SNET understand:

- Which method customers prefer on the basis of a simple description of how the method would work.
- How "education" impacts customers' preferences -- that is, what *changes* in preferences (if any) occur after customers are given information about the purported strengths and weaknesses of each option.
- What methods of *communicating* the change are preferred by customers;
- How all of the issues listed above vary by type of customer (i.e., business versus residence, smaller versus larger business, and demographic residence segments).

Study Method

This research study on area code preferences consisted of interviews, conducted by telephone, with random samples of residence and business customers throughout the state of

Connecticut. Interviews averaged approximately 14 minutes in length.

- For the *residence sample*, interviews were conducted with a sample of 864 customer households, selected at random using a *random-digit dialing* approach. Within each selected household, interviewers asked to speak with the "the person in the household who knows the most about the way [the] household uses the telephone."

Because one of the area code options being considered would have a particular impact on cellular and paging customers (*service-specific overlay*), there was a need to ensure that the residence sample included a sufficient number of cellular and paging customers (i.e., customers of any cellular or paging service provider) to analyze separately. As a result, separate interviewing *targets* were established for *cellular and paging customers with a 203 area code*; in all, a total of 200 cellular customers and 200 paging customers were interviewed within the overall sample of 864.¹ At the data processing stage of the project, these cellular and pager *oversamples* were statistically weighted back to their correct proportions in the universe, ensuring that the *total sample* results would be properly representative of residence customers as a whole.

- For the *business sample*, interviews were conducted with 302 businesses, selected at random from a list of customers supplied by SNET. Within each business, interviewers asked to speak with the "the person in the company who knows the most about the way [the] company uses the telephone." Business interviews were split by line size -- 302 interviews were conducted with *smaller to mid-sized companies* (defined as those with fewer than 300 lines) and 200 were conducted with *large companies* (300 lines or more). As was the case with the residence sample, the results were statistically weighted to bring the small vs. large distribution into line with the population distribution.

¹ Please note that for sampling purposes, customers were assigned to one of three quota groups only. Thus, customers who had both a cellular phone and a pager were counted toward one of these quotas only (selected at random). Also, please note that a customer was *unavailable* a cellular or paging customer if he/she, or someone else in the household, has a cellular phone or pager. In other words, the designation of cellular or pager was household-based rather than strictly individual-based.

The results from this survey are subject to *sampling error*.

Sampling Error

Sampling error is defined as the likely difference between the results from our sample of customers and what the results *would have been* if we had interviewed all customers in this universe, at a given level of statistical *confidence*. The level of sampling error is a function of both sample size and the percentage giving a particular answer to a question. More specifically, sampling error decreases as the size of the sample increases, and as the percentage giving a particular answer moves toward consensus (0% or 100%).

Sampling error for each major component of the sample, at the 95% level of confidence and various levels of response, is as follows:

	<i>Residence Sample</i>		<i>Business Sample</i>		
	Total (n=864)	Cellular or Pager Oversample (n=200)	Total (n=502)	Small/Mid (n=302)	Large (n=200)
<i>Level of response:</i>					
10% or 90%	+/- 2.0	+/- 4.2	+/- 2.6	+/- 3.4	+/- 4.2
20% or 80%	+/- 2.7	+/- 5.6	+/- 3.5	+/- 4.5	+/- 5.6
30% or 70%	+/- 3.0	+/- 6.4	+/- 4.0	+/- 5.2	+/- 6.4
40% or 60%	+/- 3.3	+/- 6.8	+/- 4.3	+/- 5.5	+/- 6.8
50%	+/- 3.3	+/- 6.9	+/- 4.4	+/- 5.6	+/- 6.9

Thus, for example, if 80% of the *residence customers* say they prefer method X, we can be 95% confident that the true percentage in the population who would prefer this method is 80% \pm 2.7 percentage points, or, roughly between the values of 77% and 83%.

Summary of Findings

Background and Objectives

In December of 1994, the Southern New England Telephone Company commissioned The Taylor Group, Inc., to conduct a research project to assess customers' preferences regarding methods of introducing a new area code in Connecticut. Specifically, the three area code options tested in the research were the following:

- ***Geographic Split:*** This option would divide Connecticut into two geographic regions. Everyone in one region would keep the 203 area code; everyone in the other region would get a new area code.
- ***Distributed Overlay (referred to in our interviews as "New Customers"):*** With this option, households and businesses would continue to use the 203 area code until telephone numbers run out. At that point, all *new customers* in the state would get a new area code, regardless of where in the state they live.
- ***Service-Specific Overlay (referred to in our interviews as "Specific Services"):*** With this option, a new area code would be assigned only to *specific services*, such as cellular telephones and pagers. The area code would remain the same for standard household and business service. (This option would relieve the telephone number shortage temporarily; after a few years, another option would need to be adopted.)

In general, this research was designed to provide projectable, statistically valid answers to the following questions:

- Which method of area code introduction do customers prefer on a "top-of-mind" basis – based only on a simple description

of how each method would work?

- How does "education" impact customers' preferences-- that is, what *changes* in preferences (if any) occur after customers are given information about the purported strengths and weaknesses of each option?
- What methods of *communicating* the change are preferred by customers?
- How do all of the issues listed above vary by type of customer (i.e., business versus residence, smaller versus larger business, and demographic residence segments)?

This research consisted of telephone interviews with random samples of residence customers and business customers across Connecticut. In all, a total of 864 interviews were conducted with residence customers; 502 interviews were conducted with business customers. Both the residence and business samples are designed to be representative of, and projectable to, the entire universe of residence and business customers throughout the state. Please note that the findings from this survey are subject to levels of *sampling error*; for a detailed discussion of sampling error, please see the Introduction to this report.

This section of the report presents a brief summary of the key highlights from the research. Readers interested in a more detailed discussion of the findings are encouraged to read the full report, which follows this summary.

Key Findings

I. On the basis of an initial description of the three area code options and how each would work, customers are most likely to prefer the geographic split option -- by a substantial margin.

- ***Geographic split*** was preferred by a total of 54% of residence customers and 54% of business customers.
- ***Specific services*** was a relatively distant second when it comes to customers' preferences -- chosen by 27% of residence customers and 31% of business customers.